mer

Netherlands Commission for
Environmental Assessment

Advice on Informal Draft Inception Report Zambezi Multi-Sector Agenda/ SEA/PEOTT

Memorandum by the NCEA

MOZAMBIQUE

29 April 2014

Advice of the Secretariat

To	Zambezi Valley Agency, UATA
Attn	Mr Gido Mulhovo, Mr Roberto Mito, Ms Helena Ribeiro
From	The Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment, NCEA
Date	29 April 2014
Subject	**Advice on Informal Draft Inception Report Zambezi Multi-Sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT**
	By: the Secretariat of the Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment – Reinoud Post/Ineke Steinhauer
	Advice 2014-05

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In the framework of the Terms of Reference for the Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment (NCEA) concerning involvement in the Zambezi SEA/MultisectorAgenda/PEOTT/Digital Model (signed March 2014) the NCEA received a request from the UATA (the technical and administrative support unit of ZVDA and MICOA). UATA requested NCEA's opinion, comments and recommendations on the draft Informal Inception Report produced by the TPF consortium. UATA asked to take into consideration the objectives of the different processes as presented in the ToR's submitted to the consortium. The NCEA was asked to send its comments to UATA within 10 working days from the receipt of the documents (18 April).

In the next chapters, the NCEA gives its preliminary findings. These are the joint observations on the document by the NCEA technical secretaries Reinoud Post and Ineke Steinhauer. The main observations are presented in Chapter 2, per theme and according to page numbers in the Inception report. Each paragraph concludes with (a) recommendation(s).

2. Observations by the NCEA

2.1 *Configuracão institucional* and key stakeholders

The PEOTT is the final result of the whole planning and SEA process. The PEOTT, however, cannot be made if the Multi-sector Plan (MSP) is not defined. On its turn, the MSP will not be implemented if it is not supported by and within the sector ministries (endorsement of the MSP by the council of ministers will probably not be enough to get the MSP really implemented). If there is no basis to implement the MSP, the PEOTT will also not be implemented.
Buy in of sector ministries in the MSP can probably only be achieved if these sector ministries intensively take part and have a clear influence on the MSP preparation process and its final result. This implies that the MSP formulation team must preferably be a team with fixed members of adequate level from within the relevant sector ministries complemented with adequate facilitators/mediators. For continuity reasons and reaping the benefits of group dynamics, it is advisable to have fixed teams on all institutional structures established for this planning process.

P. 10: The *configuração institucional* mentions the institutions represented in the various structures. It does not mention the names and functions within their institution of the persons that the various institutions will delegate.

P. 14-16: Par. 2.2 gives a list of key stakeholders: it is stated that this list will be up-dated continuously during the process and will require input from UATA in terms of contact details.

Does this include that identified contact persons will get access to (parts of the) the WebSite, e.g. WebSIG?

- To enable the Comissão de Coordenação and other parties to verify whether there will be adequate buy-in of the sector ministries and other stakeholders in the planning process, the final Inception Report should mention names and functions of the members of the various structures. Alternating memberships will seriously affect the quality and support for the final planning results and will determine whether the result is an executable plan or just a report.

- It is recommended to send the contact persons with the key to (selected parts of) the Web-site and WebSIG, given the fact that the model is (also) intended to support the Fóruns Participativos (p. 43).

2.2   Collection of information

p. 8: Mentions that in Annex 1 an overview is given of available existing information. Who can check whether this information is complete/sufficient?
p.25-26: Information identified during kick-off meeting: when will this be processed into WebSIG?
p. 27, par. 5.3.2: Gives a list of required information which was presented to UATA just after signing the contract. What is the aim of giving this list here?

- The NCEA recommends to present a list of which kind of information is available by now, which information is still lacking and who will be responsible for providing this information. The quality and completeness of information can subsequently be checked by the different key stakeholders.

2.3   TPF consortium team members

P. 18-20: Technical team: 13 new ones, 2 out. It is remarkable that the consultant repeatedly changes the team composition and size but in the proposed new team composition does not include the missing disciplines as asked by UATA in Aug/Sept. 2013 (e.g. tourism, energy, public health, climate change, archaeology). The new experts still do not reflect these kind of expertise. Moreover, seen the sensitive nature of the planning processes, a special focus on communication and facilitation skills would seem logical but cannot be detected from the team composition list.

- A justification for team changes should be provided (why increase of about 30%?), including why lacking fields of expertise are not included. Moreover any change of staff is subject to submitting CV's (according to UATA contractual arrangements).

2.4 The digital model

P. 32-38: On the Modelo Digital: par. 5.4.2. and 5.4.3 provide technical information and functionalities of the model. It would be good to check whether the model can indeed deliver the results as formulated in the ToR (English version, June 2013) for the model:

- Develop an integrated tool that can visualize geographically the effects of the various sector development scenario's (individually and combined) against a business as usual scenario and identify synergies and conflicts.
- Provide MICOA and Zambezi Agency with an operational Spatial interactive Land Use Plan, Multi-sector Plan and Strategic Environmental Assessment scenario and monitoring Model.
- Meet capacity building necessities and carry out training sections to MICOA, Zambezi Agency and other relevant Government officials in the use of the model to be proposed.

In addition, from the draft Inception report, it remains unclear whether the Digital Model includes an energy model (as foreseen in the ToR).

- For this check, the NCEA could solicit an expert opinion from a specialist in digital models. The information that is provided so-far is a proto-type version only with static information. Information to run an energy model should be included.

2.5 Technical issues and methodological clarifications

P. 49, par. 6.4.2: Elaborates on some specific issues, being climate change, ecosystem services valuation and cumulative assessment, but it is not clear why these 3 specific issues are explained. Regarding Ecosystem services valuation and fig. 9 (methodological zoom) it is very difficult to understand how it works. Some observations:
Why is UA (*sequestro de carbono*) placed in figure 9 separately? UA is not one of the 4 processes

- The figure suggests a so-called layered approach which is usually meant to come to an inventory of present and future problems and opportunities for development, including impacts (see box below by way of example, also applied in the coastal SEA).

Layered approach
- All proposed large-scale economic activities in the Zambezi Valley, including a description of activities in terms of location, planned interventions, projected economic outputs, and expected direct social and environmental impacts (layer 1).
- What do these combined economic activities mean for the population development of the Zambezi valley? Will there be spontaneous and/or organised migration into the area? - What are the consequences for urban development (space and facilities needed at certain locations) (layer 2).
- What (new or improved) infrastructure is required to facilitate the economic and social development as projected above (layer 3).

> - The above layers are presented on a physical map indicating present land-use, land property rights and ecosystem services and environmental and social impacts will be identified and mapped in terms of location and area of influence (layer 4).

However, it is not clear from Figure 9 why this methodological approach is chosen, and how exactly it will feed into the different processes (SEA, MSP and PEOTT).

- It is advised that TPF better explains how why different methodological approaches have been chosen and how these relate to each other. E.g. how exactly will this help the scenario development as suggested in Fig. 9.

2.6 Sustainability indicators and development of strategic vision

P. 53B, par. 6.4.3.1: Speaks about Sustainability indicators, which are said to be defined in the SEA part of the process. However, it is unclear how these will relate to the strategic vision that is to be developed under the PEOTT part of the process.

The plan formulation process will include at least 3 'high stake' issues that will need to be negotiated between the various sectors and stakeholders:
- The 'vision' for the future development of the lower Zambezi Valley.
- The set of 'environmental and social quality objectives' and what they mean in terms of concrete norms and standards for the various sectors (*indicadores de sustentabilidade*).
- The Multi Sector Plan.

Negotiations will pass more smoothly if the participants (the fixed teams mentioned under par. 2.1) are trained in negotiation techniques.

- The draft inception report does not give, but should have given details on the processes/procedures that will be applied for developing the vision and the social and environmental quality objectives (and concrete norms and standards) formulated.
- The inception report could have already provided some concrete examples of sustainability principles/indicators to contribute to formulating such a vision. Example in box below.

> *Examples of sustainability indicators, social and environmental objectives*
> - Regional development is based on inventory of ecosystem services, their stakeholders, and the optimization of their use in a participatory manner.
> - History of human occupation and exploitation of the area provides important background information on, for example, (traditional) rights of different groups.
> - No activities with long-term detrimental effects on the resources of the area.
> - No activities which may affect the livelihoods of local communities in a negative manner.
> - Water and natural disaster (incl. flood/drought) risks as leading planning principles in all territorial planning, this implies:
>   - Stimulating the use of flood-resilient structures in yearly flooded areas.

> – Concentrate human habitation and basic social services in safe areas.
> – Locate road and transport corridors in low-flow areas and make them resistant and reliable during floods.

- Mozambique has four teams of trainers trained in negotiation techniques. The draft Inception report does not mention training of this nature as part of the planning process. It is advisable to include such training for the fixed teams.

2.7   District environmental profiles

P. 54, par. 6.4.3.2 : District Environmental profiles. It is suggested that the profiles serve to identify 'potencialidades e constragimentos' for the PEOTT. But it remains unclear how they relate to the layered approach in Fig. 9. It also remains unclear whether they play a role in scenario development (this information on 'opportunities and restrictions' will be a very useful input for scenario development).

What will be the scale of the information contained in the district environmental profiles (1:50.000 as in the environmental profiles of the coastline districts or other)? This it not mentioned on p. 54.

- It is recommended to clarify how the information gathered in the environmental profiles will benefit the SEA/PEOTT/MSP and digitial model. The scale at which the profiles will be elaborated should be provided as well.

2.8   Scenario development

P. 56: Unclear which 4 variants of alternatives scenarios are made: what is understood by 'variant'?
P. 57: *Figura 11 Zoom metodológigo de Avelacão de Cenários*.
- Not clear why UA is presented here separately.
- Role AAE is not visualized here, whereas this is part of AAE!.
- The way scenario development is proposed to be done remains unclear. Figure 11 suggests as a first step 'reference scenario vs. alternative scenario', then as a second step 'reference scenario vs. sectoral scenarios'. What is the difference between the two?. Then from both steps again 4 variants of alternative scenarios will be developed without explaining what these 4 variants are about.

P. 59 The draft Inception Report proposes to weight the use of using the World Bank 2010 matrix and scenario building table as model for the lower Zambezi MSP-development. This table/scheme however seems too limited in scope for the lower Zambeze (e.g. the mining sector is absent in the scheme).

- The approach/methodology for Scenario development and comparison should better explained. The idea was: first identifying the 'business as usual' scenario: what environmental, social and economic development is expected without a multi-sector development plan. Then the development of individual sector scenarios, integrating social, environmental and economic issues in a participative manner. Subsequently, these sector scenarios are cross-checked, e.g. using consistency analysis, to find synergies and conflicts in the development of sectors. As a final step the individual sector scenarios are combined into an integrated 'common multi-sector scenario': the best combination of all sector scenarios developed, which will then be assesses on its main social, environmental and economic impacts and to compare the results of this assessment to the impacts of the 'business as usual scenario'. Subsequently some variants can be developed for the common scenario, that is for instance the first one concentrating on economic development (e.g. mining and large scale agriculture), the second one focussing on maintaining the existing identity of the area, a third one focussing on income generation for local population (social development) and a fourth one giving priority to nature conservation.

The consensus MSP (for the lower Zambezi Basin and for the time horizon of planning [30 years]) is to be built from scenario's (again: specifically for the lower Zambezi Basin and for the time horizon of planning [30 years]) of each of the relevant sectors as developed by the sectors themselves (their 'ideal' scenario).

- The Inception report should have verified whether each relevant sector has developed their 'ideal' scenario for the lower Zambezi for the time horizon of 30 years (the Inception report does not provide this information). If some sectors have not yet developed their ideal scenario, they must be asked to do so soonest and should be given a proposal for a process/procedure to formulate the scenario.

2.9 PEOTT

P. 60, par. 6.5.4: The draft Inception Report does not give information on the process or procedure of PEOTT formulation. It should have given such process information. As this is the first PEOTT process taking place, one can imagine that the process still needs to be defined.

- The Inception Report should have proposed a procedure/process for the PEOTT process.

p. 64-65: Information that will be generated under the PEOTT pillar: explain how this relates to the information generated under the AAE and PM. There seems to be quite some overlap with the information that is intended to be provided under each of the other processes (see e.g. P. 58 par. 6.4.4., especially regarding the Diagnóstico Estratégico – not so much the 'enquadramento legislativo', but rather the analysis dos factores ambientais y socais e economicos made as part of the MSP and similar work already presented in the Figures 9 and 10.)

- As already recommended by the NCEA earlier, and agreed by UATA, the Inception Report should present a table with a list of the base line information needed for each deliverable, and an additional column indicating where such data can be obtained (see also recommendation under 2.2). If the location of the data is not known, this becomes a point of discussion in the inception workshop (relevance of the data, really needed, where to find, need to collect the data). This will help to prevent potential overlapping activities as the baseline information that will be collected for the PEOTT, AAE, Plano Multisectoral and Modelo Digital, will probably be the same to a great extent for all 4 processes.

P. 65 The list presented in 'Elementos Sectorais' presents information which will be collected at the start of the PEOTT elaboration. This information could be supplemented with information on Land property issues (DUAT). Apart from mapping areas with a formal status, areas with key ecosystem services could be mapped.

- It is recommended to also map areas with ecosystem services like for example areas for Agricultural production, Cattle ranching, Forestry (timber and non-timber), Water retention areas and groundwater aquifers important for water supply to other areas, Wetlands for fish reproduction, Important water bodies for fisheries, Non-protected but unique, undisturbed or characteristic habitat with high biodiversity value, possibly combined with non-protected area with high potential for development of 'contemplative' (eco)tourism, local leisure activities, or areas of scientific importance and Multiple other services which may turn out to be important during the study (e.g. sediment trap, water purification, soil formation processes, groundwater storage and release).

2.10 Public participation processes and capacity building

P. 66: Are the cost of Public Participation events budgeted for under the consultant contract or under the UATA functioning?

P. 69: In view of the sensitivity of the process and the fact that this is a first PEOTT, meetings between the SEA team (Consultant team-UATA) and the Comissão de acompanhamento e supervisão should probably not be limited to two times in the process.

P. 69: The Scheme representing public participation process (and further explained in 6.5.1.1. and 6.5.1.2. is a mix of public/stakeholder participation events and capacity building events. Moreover, the organisation of all this puts quite some pressure on the UATA (in terms of capacity in staff and also budget?).

- It is recommended to clearly agree between UATA and the TPF consortium who is responsible for what, seen the quite ambitious participation and capacity building aims.

- It is recommended to separate the participation processes from the capacity building processes/events (now presented in 1 scheme). The draft inception report still does not include a training needs assessment. It does not make clear who will prepare, organise and give the training. The inception report should program and describe in detail the envisaged capacity building needs assessment, specifying the individuals that will participate in the planning/SEA process/PEOTT and digital model capacity building/training events and integrating their individual capacity building needs.

2.11 Communication plan

P. 77: What the draft Inception report writes about the *Plano de comunicação* has a high level of textbook content. (Page 77: does TPF state here that it will not include active communication with the media?). It is far too theoretical and not tailor-made to the Zambezi process. From the chapter it remains unclear who decides on the web-site contents and what information is planned to be put on it and who will have which rights of access to the information (presently, access is restricted). Communication events are not part and parcel of the work-plan.

- The Inception Report should have already made available a concrete plan for at least the first Forun Zambezi (although p. 93, par. 8.1.4 refers to an annex which elaborates on the first Forum, but annex not included in docs?). Questions should be addressed like for instance in the box below:

Some Key questions to design a good participation process
– what do the different stakeholder groups expect? (comissão de coordenação, UATA, Public Private platform, general public etc.) from the Forum?
– What are the restrictions in terms of time, legal rules, budget etc.?
– Is there an idea about the influence, stake, agreement/non-agreement with the contents of the work and confidence/non-confidence in the process? This helps to know who might resist the plans and who might be willing to discuss them and provide input
– What does UATA/TPF want to know from the stakeholders?
– To whom do they want to put these questions?
– How will these questions be put to the relevant stakeholders?
– When should this happen and who is responsible for organizing this?

2.12 Deliverables

P. 93: The main product of the process must be a PEOTT (a spatial plan) for the development of the lower Zambezi area in the next 30 years. This PEOTT must be formulated with the help of a strategic environmental assessment process which culminates in a report that describes the impact assessment of development options considered in the planning process and an impact assessment of the final PEOTT. An important intermediary product must be the Multi-Sector development plan on which the PEOTT will be based. Chapter 8 of the draft Inception Report does mention reports but does not mention the Multi-sector Plan and the PEOTT. The proposed MSP report seems to stop at identifying synergies and conflicts. The PEOTT report does not seem to include the Plan (PEOTT) itself.

- The inception report should include in par. 8.2.1 to 8.2.4 the intermediary and main products as mentioned above.

2.13 Project management

From chapter 9 it remains unclear what will be the composition of the consultants permanent staff in Maputo and Tete.

The NCEA has the impression that the UATA is confronted with a 2 caps problem. First cap: UATA seems to act as spokesperson for the ADVZ, the leading Mozambican contract partner of the consortium. In that capacity UATA must judge and correct the quality of the TPF work. Second cap: the UATA is also the manager/facilitator of the integrated planning process and in that capacity UATA should be co-author of the products coming out of the process. The tasks the draft Inception Report attributes to the UATA seems to confirm this analysis.

- The Inception report should explain how permanent staff presence of the TPF consortium will be organized and guaranteed. Given the importance of the participative processes, commitment of and dialogue between stakeholders and complexity of the whole process, permanent presence is an essential key factor to success

- To avoid frictions in later stages, the final Inception Report should include a table that clearly and unambiguously spells out the division of tasks between the UATA and the consultants team, including a set of rules that spell out the way or working together.

- The final Inception report should give the correct interpretation of the competence and obligations of the UATA. The 2 caps problem should be solved by giving the UATA just one single cap.